

POST

MORNING 15, 1941
SUNDAY 14, 1945

CPYRIGHT

CPYRIGHT

Latin American News Notes

Goodwin Being Eased Out Of Latin Post

CPYRIGHT
JEANNE S. PERRY

One of the "New Frontiers" most controversial appointees has been Richard Goodwin. The 31-year-old Latin "expert" arrived on the Washington scene just



little over a year ago. Goodwin stepped in at a time when this government was laying the foundation for what was hoped greatly improve relations with Latin America.

The man who directs policy on Latin America, whether it be from the White House or the State Department, should be thoroughly cognizant of the sensitive problems involved. He should know and understand the individual countries and their individual needs. He should know when to be tactful, and when to be forceful and strong. He should speak the language. Mr. Goodwin was woefully lacking in any of those categories. Time and "learning on the job" have not appreciably helped to improve Mr. Goodwin's fundamental defects in these areas.

Several weeks ago Goodwin quietly left on what was described as a "vacation". Washington sources reveal that Goodwin's post will now fall to Edward Martin. The present Assistant Secretary of State for Latin Affairs assumed his post last March. We are told that Martin entered the picture with the understanding that he would absorb Goodwin's duties as rapidly as fact would allow. It is therefore expected that the White House will announce Mr. Martin's elevation in the very near future.

Martin is a 48-year-old native of Wisconsin. He was with the FBI from 1933-1950. Since 1953 Martin has been a foreign service officer with the Department of State. In 1955 he was the director of a mission in Guatemala.

We are advised that Edward Martin is well versed on financial matters. We have discussed Martin with various prominent Latins, and he is very acceptable to all of them. Let us hope that the appointment of Martin signals the beginning of a strong working relationship between the U.S. and Latin America.

What the political future holds for Goodwin is not known at this time. The administration continues to remain silent on the whole issue of Goodwin.

Last October, when the Administration sent up a "trial balloon" when Goodwin was under consideration as a possible successor to U.S. Ambassador Roy Rubottom in Argentina. The official "leak" of Goodwin's pending appointment was met with dismay and disbelief on the part of Argentina, and other Latins. Negative reaction in other quarters was responsible for the White House dropping that project. Several weeks later it was revealed that Goodwin would be promoted from his White House job to that of Secretary of State for Latin Affairs.

Correspondents Karl Meyer (Washington Post) and Tad Szulc (NY Times) have collaborated on a book called "The Cuban Invasion". Both writers are on close terms with Richard Goodwin and Arthur Schlesinger Jr.

Meyer and Szulc have let it be known that the White House favored the idea of such a book. Also, that the "inside information" contained therein was made available through Goodwin and Schlesinger.

Had this book been an accurate account, it would be worthwhile reading. As it stands, "The Cuban Invasion" not only contains many errors but ignores the facts. The authors lay sole blame for the invasion on the laps of the CIA and Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The book's first appearance

on April 18. In spite of the fact that one of the authors is a Times man, no review has appeared in the liberal New York paper.

The job of reviewing "The Cuban Invasion" was given to Hal Hendrix. Mr. Hendrix is well known to us. He has spent much time in Cuba and Latin America as a correspondent. He knows these countries and their people. He is also an accurate and frank writer.

Hendrix made several reviews of the book. The first review was submitted to the N.Y. Times in advance of the book's publication date. All of Mr. Hendrix's reviews have, so far, been rejected by the Times as being too unsympathetic.

We have questioned friends who have read the book in question, and have also had the opportunity to read the reviews by Hendrix. They all agree that the reviews are objective and forthright. The consensus is that the Times will try to find themselves another reviewer. One who will find little or no fault with the work of one of the Times' own men.